Mr. JAMES ELLIOTT is authorized to receive and receipt for subscriptions and advertisements for the Daily and the Weekly National Era, in Cincin-

### WASHINGTON, D. C.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1854.

THE POLICY OF NON-INTERVENTION IN RELA-TION TO SLAVEBY.

The advocates of the policy of Non-Interven tion by the Federal Government in relation to Slavery, say that it is the only constitutional democratic, safe, and beneficent policy, "old as the Government itself, and founded upon the doctrine of strict construction."

Congress was empowered by the Constitu tion to put an end to the slave trade in 1808, and thereby cut off the supply of foreign slaves to the Southern market, and it did exercise this power the moment it had the right to do This was Intervention. Was it constitutional, democratic, safe, and beneficent ?

A clause was inserted in the Constitution stipulating that a person held to service or labor in one State, escaping into another, should be delivered up on claim, &c. As this was by its very terms a clause of compact, containing and implying no grant of power to Congress to provide for its execution, but to be fulfilled by the States, we hold that its intent and effect were, not to impose any duty of Intervention on the part of the Federal Government. But, Congress assumed power, in 1793, over the subject, and passed a law to carry into effect this provision, and in 1850 again assumed power, passing another law far more stringent and arbitrary, for the same purpose. Was not this, Intervention by the Federal Government with Slavery? And who are responsible for it but these same noisy advocates of Non-Intervention as the only true policy?

Congress in 1802, re-enacted the entire slave code of Virginia and Maryland, in the ten miles square ceded by those States to the Gen eral Government; and Slavery to this day exists in this District, in virtue alone of Congressional ensatment.

Is this intervention, constitutional, demo

cratic, safe, and beneficent? O, yes!

Congress, in 1798, prohibited the importation of any slaves into the Territory of Mississippi, brought from without the limits of the United States, under heavy penalties, providing at the same time that any slaves imported in violation of the law should at once receive their freedom. Was this Non-Intervention? Was the law constitutional, democratio, safe, beneficent?

Congress, in 1804, not only enacted a similar law in relation to the Territory of Louisiana but it prohibited any slave from being carried into that Territory, except by a citizen of the United States, the bona fide owner of such slave, removing to the Territory for actual set-

Was this Non-Intervention? Was the law sonstitutional, democratic, safe, beneficent? Congress, in 1807, enacted a law regulating

the traffic in slaves coastwise. Was this Non-Intervention?

The Federal Executive, when the Spani colonies on the continent revolted, and their armies were meditating a descent upon Cuba, which they had a perfect right to seize and sternly that the Government of the United States could not tolerate any such act, as it would inevitably involve the emancipation of the slaves in Cuba, and thereby endanger the stability of the slave system in the South.
Slaveholders and their Northern allies, the

pretended advocates of Non-Intervention, have always approved of that gross act of Intervention, just as they have approved of the more recent threats of the Administration, through its "organ" in Washington, to intervene for the preservation of Slavery in Cuba, against the efforts of Great Britain and France in favor of its abolition. Yes-this very "organ," with its brazen throat speaking fiercely or Non-Intervention, had the hardihood a few vention of the Federal Government, vi et armis, to preserve the Slavery of the African race in Cuba! weeks ago to threaten Spain with the Inter-

The records of our Diplomacy show that formerly repeated attempts were made by the Government of the United States to negotiate a treaty with Great Britain for the reclamation of fugitive slaves from the South, finding a refuge in Canada; and that a few years ago formal demands were made upon the British Gov ernment, and urged with great pertinacity, fo compensation for slaves in American vessels driven by stress of weather into British ports.

Was that Non-Intervention?
The truth is, historically, Non-Intervention is a lie. It has never been the policy of the General Government; it is not now its policy. The advocates of it do not believe it, dare not rust it dare not follow it out to its legitimate consequences. What! will they vote for the repeal of the law re-enacting the slave code in the District of Columbia, for the repeal of the law regulating the coastwise slave trade, for the repeal of the law of 1793 and that of 1850, on the subject of fugitives from service or labor? Will they join with us in condemning the action of the Federal Executive in uphold-ing Slavery in Cuba, and in demanding fugiive slaves from Great Britain ? What is their eal meaning? Simply this: that Intervention when it will answer the purposes of Slavery, is a great and glorious Principle of Democracy; but, when it will inure to the benefit of Freeom, is unconstitutional and anti-Democratic hat Intervention is always wrong when against

New Jates on! The bald humbug! Leave the People of a Territory free to govern themcalves—they have the right—the principle of popular self-government is coeval with the Constitution, founded upon strict construction, Demogratic, all-glorious:—therefore — what?
Wz, the Representatives of the thirty-one
States of this Union, will ordain a Constitution ho have no voice in our election ; we will degible to office; how many and what offices there shall be; how they shall be filled; what salaries shall be attached to them; what shall be

the nature and extent of their functions: we will not allow them to elect their Judges, their Secretary of State, their Governor; we will apply to them all the laws of the United States we think applicable to their condition : and we will require that whatever laws may be passed by the Territorial Legislature shall be submit-

And yet we are called upon to admire the Principle of Self Government, as applied to the People of a Territory! The Bill of Mr. Douglas is itself a total denial of this Principle in

such an application. And then, the People are to be cheated with another fraud. Let the Territorial Legislature regulate the subject of Slavery as its constitu ents may decide, subject to the Constitution of the United States. "This is the doctrine, shout the paid presses of Slavery at the North "who will not trust the People? No fear that Slavery will be introduced into Nebraska, if they are left to decide the question. Better for Freedom than all the Congressional legislation

in the world!" Have honor, fair dealing, common hones seased to exist? Do not these presses know that they are guilty of infamous deception Their masters at the South deny that a Terri torial Legislature has the power to exclude Slavery. Fortunately, the following article from the Charleston (S. C.) Mercury, furnished a timely exposure of the imposition they are attempting upon the People of the North. There is one thing about Masterdom that exalts it heaven-high above the supple Servility that bends the knee before it-it is too proud to sneak, too andacious to play the hypocrite Read what follows, and then say what you think of Self Government, Non-Intervention and other humbugs, peddled at the North:

"Senator Douglas—Squatter Sovereignty.— The Boston Post, in commenting upon this gentleman's recent speech, takes much pleasure in finding, as it asserts, its favorite doctrine of SQUATTER SOVEREIGNTY, OR THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY TO LEGISLATE UPON ALL LEGAL SUBJECTS, AND THEREBY TO UPON ALL LEGAL SUBJECTS, AND THEREBY TO EXCLUDE SLAVERY, fully maintained and vindicated. WE CANNOT ASSENT TO ANY SUCH CONSTRUCTION of the speech, and of the bill which it sustains, without imputing duplicity to the former, and an unconstitutional character to the latter. For, if it is intended to be argued by Senator Douglas, that in creating Territorial Governments, invested with the usual Territorial Governments, invested with the usual powers, they can legislate so as to exclude and abolish Slavery, when the very law which organizes them declares the Territories open to the immigration and settlement of the slave holder, we must reject such a proposition as not only unconstitutional, but as containing upon its very face the mark of treachery. It would indeed be the climax of specious justice, to proclaim Non Intervention on the part of Congress as the principle of fairness and the Constituas the principle of fairness and the Constitu-UPON A TENT-FULL OF HUNTERS AND OUT LAWS THE RIGHT TO INTERVENE IN THE MOST LAWS THE RIGHT TO INTERVENE IN THE MOST ABSOLUTE AND SOVEREIGN MANNER. If the Compromise of 1850, and the present bill for the admission of Nebraska, really mean anything of fairness and justice to the South, if the latter be not intended as a trap to catch her support for a principle seemingly of value to her, we are not in error in saying to slave-holders, here lies this Territory, go into it with your property, if you will, and you shall be safe, until, as a sovereign State, the people decide for or against the institution. Otherwise the Nebruska bill is a worthless and deceptive truce.

"But we mistake Mr. Douglas if such as inference can be properly drawn from his a gument and bill. Indeed, whatever may his own views on the subject the hill itself me his own views on the subject, the bill itself pro-vides, in the first place, that all laws passed by the Territorial Government, 'shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States, and if disondly, that 'all cases involving title to slaves and questions of personal freedom, shall be sub-ject to the ultimate decision of the Supreme Court of the United States? So far, therefore, from these Governments being empowered to exclude Slavery, any action they may take upon the subject would be a matter for discus-sion and decision, both by Congress and the Supreme Court of the United States. Should Supreme Court of the United States. Should the issue arise upon a law excluding or abolishing Slavery, the question of the power to pass such a law would be the first inquiry; and a decision which acknowledged that power in the teeth of proclaimed non-intervention, and the rights of the slaveholder, would be as iniquitous as it is absurd. It would be Congressional intervention one step removed, not so direct as the Missouri Compromise or the Wilmot Proviso, but more insidious and fatal, because, while professing equality in theory, Congress and the Supreme Court would become the instruments of wrong, wielded by the hands of others."

We have received of Hilbus & Hitz Music Dealers, Pennsylvania avenue, betwee 10th and 11th streets, the following peices of music: "Let us Speak of a Man as we Find Him." Dedicated to the Hon. John P. Halewords by J. Simmons. "Eva to her Papa," as sung by little Cordelia Howard, in her original character of the Gentle Eva, in Uncle Tom's Cabin-words by her father, G. Howard.

MEETING AT NEW YORK TO-NIGHT. - A umerously signed call appears in the New York papers, upon the citizens of New York who are opposed to the violation of the Missouri Compromise and the extension of Slave Territory, to meet at the Tabernacle, this evening, to utter their stern protest against the threatened breach of faith, and their determin ed hostility to any encroachment by the slave power on the rights of free labor in the territory secured by that compact.

# MR. BOTTS

"It will surprise nobody to learn that Mr. John Minor Botts is against the Nebraska bill. He was never bound to the institution of Slavery by any tie of interest."—Richmond Enquirer.

What a rebuke is this to Northern flunkeyism! What a keen perception of motives ha the Richmond Enquirer! What man, with the heart and soul of a man, whose judgment is not controlled by his interests, can sar so great a wrong as that of human thraidom The Enquirer understands this, and speaks forth in all candor. The South under this, and contemns and despises the suppl tools it uses.

The first train over the new road, avoiding the inclined planes on the Pennsylvania rail-road, arrived at Pittsburgh on Wednesday af-ternoon, the 15th instant, in fifteen hours from Philadelphia.

A private letter, says the N. York Tribune, from Kosseth, dated London, January 24, and addressed to a gentleman in this country, concludes by saying: "You shall soon hear of a Titanic work on our part; of our heaping Ossa upon Pelion, with but our nails for tools."

een adopted, Mr. CHASE said: I desire to submit an amendment, to insert immediately after the words which have just been inserted, the folwing:
"Under which the people of the Territory,

through their appropriate representatives, may, if they see fit, prohibit the existence of Slavery I ask for the yeas and nays upon the amend-

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CHASE. I will state, in very few words, the design of this amendment. The amendment just adopted declares that it is the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate Slavery into any Territory or State, nor to ex-clude it therefrom; but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States. The amendment had already declared the Missouri prohibition inconsistent with the principle of non-intervention by Congress with Slavery in the States and Territories, as recognised by the legislation of 1850, commonly called the Compromise Measures. It will be seen that the amendment just adopted does two things. It puts a construction on the acts of 1850 and then it construction on the acts of 1850 and then it construction on the acts of 1850 and then it construction on the acts of 1850 and then it construction on the acts of 1850 and then it construction on the acts of 1850 and then it construction on the acts of 1850 and then it construction on the acts of 1850 and then it construction on the acts of 1850 and then it construction on the acts of 1850 and then it construction on the acts of 1850 and then it construction on the acts of 1850 and then it construction on the acts of 1850 and then it construction on the acts of 1850 and then it construction of the acts of 1850 and then it construction of the acts of 1850 and then it construction of the acts of 1850 and then it construction of the acts of 1850 and then it construction of the acts of the a just adopted does two things. It puts a construction on the acts of 1850, and then it construes the act of which it is a part. It declares the principle of the acts of 1850 inconsistent with the Missouri prohibition; and it declares for the act, of which it forms a part, that its design is to leave the subject of Slavery to be disposed of by the people of the Territories, subject only to the limitations of the Constitution of the United States.

Now, I desire to have the sense of the Sen-

Now, I desire to have the sense of the Senate upon the question, whether or not, under the limitations of the Constitution of the United States, the people of the Territories can prohibit the existence of Slavery there?

There can be no reasonable objection to the expression of the judgment of the Senate on

this question. The very amendment just adopted is, for the most part, only an expression of the judgment of the Senate on a question of interpretation. The only real words of legislation in it are these: "Is hereby declared inoperative and void;" all the rest is opinion, judgment, intent.

Now, I want a little clearer understandin of one important point. I want the judgment of the Senate upon the question whether, under the limitations of the Constitution, the people of the Territories can protect themselves

against Slavery?
After I have obtained a vote on this qu After I have obtained a vote on this ques-tion, I shall want to know—and if no other Senator shall do it, I will move amendments calculated to ascertain—whether it be intend ed to give the principle of Non-Intervention, asserted by the bill, full scope? If it is to be adopted, I want to see it fully and thoroughly

been adopted, that it will have opposite inter pretations in different sections of the country in one section it will be construed as leaving In one section it will be construed as leaving the whole subject of Slavery completely at the disposition of the People of the Territories; and in another section as so binding up the people, by its reference to the limitations of the Constitution, that they can in no case, and by no means, however disposed to do so, protect themselves against the introduction of Slavery. I shall detain the Senate, for the present, no longer. My desire only is, that the Senate and the country may understand clearly the scope and purpose of the amendment I now submit, and to have a vote, by ayes and noes, upon it.

[Mr. Pratt, of Maryland, here made an attempt to amend Mr. Chase's amendment to an amendment, by inserting the words "or introduce" after the word "prohibit," but it was ruled out of order. Mr. Jones, of Tennessee, also asked, if Mr. Chase's amendment were adopted, would he vote for the bill?]

Mr. Chase resumed: Mr. President, I have no objection whatever to answer the question

no objection whatever to answer the question put to me from the honorable Senator from Tennessee. I say to him distinctly, that I will not vote for this bill, unless relieved of every clause looking towards the abrogation of the Missouri prohibition.

But, sir, is anything less doubtful than that it is the right and duty of a Senator, who see that a bill containing important receives

that a bill containing important provisions, so obnoxious as to make it impossible for him to vote for it, is yet likely to pass the Senate—is it not, I say, the right and duty of a Senator, under such circumstances, to endeavor as far as practicable to make the bill in other re-spects such as he desires it to be? A meas-ure of legislation may fail to commend itself to my jugdment, and yet may be rendered vastly less obnoxious by amendment than in its original shape. I have moved this amendment therefore, in good faith. I wish to see the bill perfected, as near as may be, in accordan with the principle upon which it is said to

I remarked, when last up, that I should probably have other amendments to offer, and may as well indicate briefly the nature of those amendments.

hose amendments.

The advocates of the bill say that it is fran The advocates of the bill say that it is framed upon the principle of non-intervention. But what kind of non-intervention? You refer the question of Slavery to the people of the Territories, to be acted upon through their Legislatures; do you not? Certainly you say so. But then the Legislature of the Territory is to act upon that question, subject to the restrictions and limitations of the Constitution of the United

Now, sir, there are great differences of opinion here as to what the limitations and restrict Now, sir, there are great differences of opinion here as to what the limitations and restrictions of the Constitution are. Some Senators think that the Constitution of the United States has no operation at all in the Territories, unless extended to them by express enactment. Other Senators are of opinion that the Constitution extends over the Territories from the moment of acquisition. Other Senators maintain that the Constitution, properly interpreted, would have prevented the existence of Slavery in the Territories altogether, and would render it impossible for a Territorial Legislature to introduce Slavery by a valid enactment. Other Senators contend that, under the Constitution, no Territorial Legislature can exclude Slavery. Now, sir, I desire to have the sense of the Senate upon the question, whether the Territorial Legislatures to which you propose to refer this great question—vital to the future destiny of the people who are to emigrate into those Territories—can, "subject to the Constitution," protect themselves, if they see fit to do so, from Slavery? The Senator from Maryland [Mr. Pratt] has proposed an amendment to my amendment. I cannot accept it. But it will be entirely within the power of the Senate, after adopting my amendment, to agree to his, if they see fit to do so.

[Mr. Shields asked Mr. Chase to accept the

his, if they see fit to do so.

[Mr. Shields asked Mr. Chase to accept the amendment of the Senator from Maryland, for the purpose of testing the question.]

I was about to state why I could not accept the amendment of the Senator from Maryland. I have no objection that the vote should be taken upon it; and it is probable that it would receive the sanction of a majority here. But with my views of the Constitution, I cannot vote for it. I do not believe that a Territorial Legislature, though it may have the power to dature, though it may have the power to contect the people against Slavery, is conally competent to introduce it. A y here probably think otherwise.

REMARKS OF MR CHASE, ON THE TERRITORIAL

In the U.S. Senate, February 15, 1854.

The amendment moved by Mr. Douglas to the 14th section of the substitute reported by the Committee on Territories, having been adopted, whether it is not fairest to take a separate vote whether it is not fairest to take a separate vote whether it is not fairest to take a separate vote whether it is not fairest to take a separate vote whether it is not fairest to take a separate vote whether it is not fairest to take a separate vote. whether it is not fairest to take a separate vote upon each proposition? If there be a majority who believe that the people of a Territory can, under the Constitution, protect themselves from Slavery, let them say so. And if another and a different majority, who think that the people of a Territory can, if they see fit, introduce Slavery, let them say so. There is nothing in the adoption of the one amendment which would preclude the adoption of the other. But let us have a vote upon the distinct and substantive proposition, unembarrassed by connection with any other; then let the proposition of the Senator from Maryland be submitted and voted upon, unembarrassed by any connection with mine. This is fair. In my judgment, it is the only fair mode of ascertaining the sense of the Senate. The sole object of my amendment is to let the people of the country see whether those who assert the principle of non-intervention are willing that the people of the Territories may, if they see fit, exclude Slavery.

Mr. President, I have referred to the limitations under which the Territorial Legislatures are to act under the provisions of this bill.

are to act under the provisions of this bill.

They may legislate, among other subjects, upon that of Slavery. But how? Freely? Without restraint? Is non-intervention the real principle of this bill? Why, sir, according to one of the provisions of this bill, every act of the Territorial Legislature is subject to act of the Territorial Legislature is subject to the absolute veto of a Government appointed here. The bill gives the appointment of the Governor to the President. He is made removable by the President. He holds his office only during Executive pleasure; and this Governor, thus appointed, thus removable, thus subject in all respects to Executive control, is to have an absolute veto on every act of the Territorial Legislature. Is that non-intervention? That, sir, is one of the provisions which I shall propose to strike from the bill.

Then, sir, every case between parties litigant which arises under any act of the Territorial Legislature, must, of course, come before the

Legislature, must, of course, come before the court. Now, who are to be the judges of the court. Now, who are to be the judges of these courts? Are they to be elected by the people? Appointed by the Legislature? Not at all. Every one of them, under the provisions of this bill, is to be appointed and commissioned here. So that all Territorial acts, and all rights claimed under them, are to be brought under the revision of judges, not responsible to the people of the Territory, nor deriving their powers from them, but dependent wholly upon Executive patronage and favor—judges appointed by the President, and, according to recent practice sanctioned by the Senate, removable by him at pleasure. And this, sir, is not all. Not only is the Territorial Legislature, under the provisions of this bill, placed under the control of an appointee of the Federal Executive; not only are its acts subject to revision of judges appointed and removable by the President, but all its legislation is to be reported to Congress; and every act may, if Congress shall Congress; and every act may, if Congress shall see fit to disapprove of it, be declared null and

void.

I call attention to these provisions, Mr. President, as features of a bill which, in my judgment are totally irreconcilable with the principle of non-intervention, upon which it is said the bill itself is constructed. For the present, I only ask for a vote upon the amendment I have offered. I propose, hereafter, to offer other amendments designed to remove this provision and to carry out as far as presidents. vision, and to carry out, as far as practicable, the professed principle of the bill, and refer all questions of legislation and administration, within the limits of the Territories, to the un-

Mr. BADGER said that the effect and design of the amendment were to overrule and subvert the very proposition introduced into the kill upon the motion of the chairman of the bill upon the motion of the chairman of the Committee on Territories. The provision as it stands, he said, since the amendment has it stands, he said since the amendment has reference to the territorial authorities, or the people themselves, to determine upon the ques-tion of Slavery; and, therefore, by the very terms as well as by the obvious meaning and legal operation of that amendment, to enable them either to exclude, or to introduce, or allow

Slavery.

Mr. B. argued this at some length, and to prove the purpose of Mr. Chase, quoted his words, as follows:

"We believe no permanent adjustment of

"We believe no permanent adjustment of that question possible, except by a return to that original policy of the fathers of the Re-public, by which Slavery was restricted within State limits; and freedom, without exception or limitation, was to be secured to every per-son outside of State limits, and under the ex-clusive jurisdiction of the General Govern-

clusive jurisdiction of the General Government."

Mr. B. also urged the insertion of the words suggested by Mr. Pratt.

Mr. BROWN said: I learn from the remarks which the honorable Senator from North Carolina has submitted, that he thinks that by the vote which we have just taken upon the amendment submitted by the chairman of the Committee on Territories, we have yielded more than I think we have yielded. I have not, in my own judgment, and I trust I have not in my action here, yielded the principle that the people of the Territories, during their Territoriol existence, have the right to exclude Slavery. I have not intended to yield that point, and I do not mean that my action, in future times, shall be so construed. As I am not prepared with authorities to go on upon this precise point this evening, I hope that I shall be allowed about fifteen minutes before the vote is taken, when I will have the authorities with me, to give my views upon this point, ities with me, to give my views upon this point, and this alone.

and this alone.

Mr. CASS said: The honorable Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Brown] has touched on one of the main questions connected with this bill, and which has not been touched upon before. It is a very grave and a very important question. The power of the people of the Territories to legislate upon their internal concerns, during the period of these temporary Governments, is most clearly given in this bill, if the Constitution permits it.

Mr. BADGER. Containty.

the Constitution permits it.

Mr. BADGER. Certainly.

Mr. CASS. If the Constitution does not per-

Mr. CASS. If the Constitution does not permit, they have not got it.

Mr. CASS. Behind that stands the other question, which must be discussed here; and I, for one, am determined that my constituents shall know my views on the point. It is one on which the honorable Scuator from Mississippi and myself differ, and have differed radically, but on which, as I trust, we differ, and shall differ, properly. It is whether, by virtue of the Constitution of the United States, there is a kind of motive power in Slavery that immediately spreads it over any Territory, or by virtue of which any slave may be taken to any Territory of the United States, as soon as it is annexed to the Unit

leave it under the Constitution, to be decided by the law tribunals of the country; and that is the true ground upon which to put it.

Mr. DAWSON concurred.

Mr. CASS. That is a matter to be argued. I differ from the honorable Senator in toto.

Mr. WELLER. Although, as I said in my remarks on Monday last, I am in favor of the general principles of the bill, there are some provisions in it which do not receive the sanction of my indement. I may refer to that tion of my judgment. I may refer to that which confers upon the Governor an unqualified veto. I do not think I can vote for any Territorial bill which contains a provision of

Mr. DOUGLAS. The friends of this bill Mr. DOUGLAS. The friends of this bill have had the provision to which the Senator from California has referred, and some others, under consideration, and they intend to dispose of these two points—that is, the veto power of the Governor, and as to the revisary power of Congress when we arrive at them. These two provisions are in this bill because they were in the Utah bill, which was our guide. After some further conversation, the Senate

EXTRACTS FROM OUR CORRESPONDENCE.

A subscriber sends us the proceedings of a meeting at Poughkeepsie, Dutchess county, N. Y., in Mr. Dean's district, held February 13th, for the purpose of denouncing the attempt now on foot to repeal the Missouri Compromise. Hon. Abraham Baker, aided by several Vice Presidents, presided. Speeches were made by W. Wilkinson, C. Bartlett, James Emmett, and W. H. Van Wagner. Among the resolutions adopted were the following :

"Resolved, That there are limits to political generosity and for bearance, beyond which concessions, ceasing to be laudable and patriotic, become degrading and ignominious.

"Resolved, That whether we have regard to

constitutions, laws, com acts, compromises, or to the teachings and examples of Washington, Jefferson, and other sages and patriots of the Revolution, we are constrained to feel and to avow that the bill of Senator Douglas, repealing the Missouri Compromise, and opening the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska to the admission of Slavery, is uncalled for, anti-republican in its principles and tendencies, a gross breach of plighted faith, a fountain of political demoralization and of national discord—a bill, in fine, fraught with the greatest evils, both

present and prospective, to our own country."

Our correspondent adds, that Mr. Dean, being on a visit to his constituents, lately, found the feeling against the bill much stronger than he had supposed.

A subscriber from Wilmot's district Penn-

sylvania, writes, that great excitement prevails there, and a call for a public meeting at Towanda, Bradford county, headed by David Wil-

Oxford, Michigan, Feb. 9 .- "The Nebraska Territorial bill has awakened profound interest. We shall protest against it by petitions, and sustain the Independent Democrats in the position they have taken. Would to God we and a voice in Congress of the same sort!" Meetings to protest against the bill are an-

ounced all over the free States. A subscriber at Whitewater. writes: "These are perilous times for Freedom. The Nebraska bill out-Herod's Herod. Northern dough has become so soft that it can hardly keep its shape over night. We in this State are living on soil free from Slavery, through the operation of the Ordinance of 1787, and it grieves us to see the dark cloud of Slavery spreading towards territory entitled to the

same boon by the legislation of 1820." CHARLESTON, S. C., Feb. 14, 1854. Southern Representatives! a call is now made on your wisdom, which will put it to a in future times, either by the grateful remembrance or the hearty maledictions of the Southern People. Reflect deeply upon this matter. If you allow yourselves to be caught on that gilded bait, a stain will be fastened on the repgilded hait, a stain will be lastened on the rep-utation of your constituents which will be most difficult ever to remove. If, on the contrary, you show yourselves their true Representatives, you will establish on a firmer basis than ever that reputation for honesty and magnanimity which is the essential feature of its character.

# THE SECOND VOICE OF CHICAGO.

A few personal and political friends of Judge Douglas crited a public meeting at the South Market Hall, on Saturday evening last, for the purpose of counteracting, if possible, the effect of the meeting held on the 8th inst. So great is the excitement here on that question, that the people assembled at the hour appointed in large numbers so that the hall was filled to

overflowing. The result was, a complete discomfiture of the Douglas men.

The meeting, after hearing all the speeches of the advocates of the bill, voted down the resolutions by an overwhelming majority, and passed others, affirming the action of the prepassed others, affirming the action of the pre-vious meeting. The prominent actors in this meeting, both for and against the bill, were old line Democrats. The other parties are unanimous against the hill. It seems I made a slight mistake in my last

communication. There are six instead of five daily papers in this city. They are all oppos-ed to the Nebraska bill: so are all the other city papers. Chicago, Feb. 15, 1854.

THE RIVALRY OF CITIES .- There is a quiet colness about the following, from the Philadelphia Daily Register, that refreshes us even

in this frosty season of the year:

"It is one of the coincidences of the day, that
the Africa and America, the two last steamships from Europe, are both stuck in the mud the former at New York and the latter at Bos the former at New York and the latter at Boston. These places are both very respectable villages, and we should be glad if they had perfectly safe and commodious harbors, into which large vessels could easily enter. It can hardly be expected, however, that anything short of a large city and commodious and safe harbor, like that of Philadelphia, will eventuation. harbor, like that of Philadelphia, will eventually answer for our foreign commerce. We have made no boasts of our superiority in this respect, but are willing, now that these accidents have happened to our neighbors, to suggest an easy way to escape such dangers in tuture. We hope to hear that these steamers are got off before the arrival of others, so that they may not all be detained on this side, and the regular communication broken off."

Willis J. Hardy, who had already a wife in Boston, married Miss Brown, in Philadelphia, in September last, and Mrs. Parker, of the same city, in January. Willis is now in jail, awaiting a trial for his crimes, and may have the assurance of our hearty wish that his punishment may be such as will most effectually deter other scoundrels like himself from mitating his example. He is a bad, unfeeling man-corrupt and cruel, clear down to the utmost depths of his fiendish heart, is this Willis

#### CONGRESS.

THIRTY-THIRD CONGRESS-FIRST SESSION. In the Senate, yesterday, Mr. Seward spoke for three hours in opposition to the Nebraska

bill; when

Mr. Pettit moved the postponement of the
further consideration of the bill to Monday
next, expressing a wish to be heard that day.

Mr. Sumner desired to be heard on the question, and gave notice that he would follow Mr.
Pettit on Tuesday.

The Senate adjourned till Monday.

In the House of Representatives, after Mr. Campbell had concluded,
Mr. Kerr, of North Carolina, spoke in support of the Nebraska bill. He reverenced the sacredness of the Compromise of 1850, and believed the measure now contemplated was in perfect accordance with it.
Mr. Giddings made a brief explanation of some historical facts in connection with the purchase of Louisiana; after which, the Committee rose.

aittee rose, And the House adjourned until Monday.

The Galena Jeffersonian, the leading Dem cratic paper in the northwestern portion of Illinois, comes out manfully for freedom.

"Mr. Douglas's Nebraska bill is a bomb shell in our camp. We rejoice to know that it will be actively and vigorously opposed. It asks much, and it asks for Slavery. We shall oppose the measure with what ability and in-

ustry we may possess."

As yet, but a single Democratic paper in H has come to the support of the bill.

Ravenna (Ohio) Star.

From the N. Y. Evening Post.

MORE "RELIGIOUS FANATICISM' Those who demand the repudiation of the

Those who demand the repudiation of the Missouri covenant excluding Slavery from the Northern Territories of the Union, are likely to have a great deal of trouble with what their organ, the Washington Union, calls "religious facaticism." The New York Observer, one of the calmest of conservative journals, has returned to the attack. In its yesterday's issue it says of the Nebraska bill, now before Con-

present time, we are satisfied will only renew the agitation which has been so calamiteus in the past and so threatening for the future. It will be regarded at the North as a breach of faith on the part of the South, and not the less faith on the part of the South, and not the less so because the measure was proposed and is strongly advocated by Northern men. It will open the whole subject anew. It will, we fear, be the end, as the present is only the beginning, of rest upon the vexed subject of Slavery. It will be said that if one Compromise may be violated, so may another. That if it is right to disturb and repeal the Compromise of 1820, so will it be to seek the repeal of that of 1850. Timely discussion of the measure may avert such consequences, by preventing the passage of the bill. \* \* \* \* \* \*

"The agitation once renewed on such a plan The agitation once renewed on such a plausible pretext, it will be difficult again to allay it. If this Compromise be set aside, it will be the end of all Compromises. We would again call for the arrest of a measure fraught with such consequences, the end of which no prophet can foretell."

et can foretell."

The Christian Intelligencer, the organ of the Dutch Reformed Churches, is equally "fanatical," and even more emphatic. It says:

"The Nebraska bill of Senator Douglas has already set the whole country in a blaze, and we should regard ourselves as derelict in duty the bould our columns be gillest expection that we should regard ourselves as derence in duty should our columns be silent respecting that huge iniquity, which political craft is now stri-ving to perpetrate through that measure. \* \* "Of late years, a new doctrine has sprung up

at the South—the opposite extreme of Northern fanaticism—which maintains that Slavery is a positive good, an actual blessing, and ought to be extended. To this doctrine the Freemen of be extended. To this doctrine the Freehold, the North will never give their adhesion. And now, when Senator Douglas and his condjunos, when Senator Douglas are through a measure which, tors attempt to force through a measure that every organ of public opinion at the North should speak out against the threatened infa-my and wrong. Let the South beware of ask-ing too much from the obliging and compro-mising spirit of the North."

## BY HOUSE'S PRINTING TELEGRAPH TELEGRAPHIC CORRESPONDENCE

FOR DAILY NATIONAL ERA. Luke Burns Convicted of Murder.

Baltimore, Feb. 18.—The jury to whom was submitted the case of Luke Burns, for stabbing fatally Peter Miller, on the 24th of December last, have just rendered a verdict to the court of guilty of murder in the first degree, but recommending him to be sentenced to the penitentiary for life. The prisoner heretofore, according to the testimony at the trial, has borne a good character.

The Steamer City of Glasgow. PHILADELPHIA, FEB. 18 .- The steamer City of Glasgow has arrived at this port, from Liverpool. She brings no news, it having been all superseded.

Opposition to the Nebraska bill.

BOSTON, FEB. 17 —A Convention of the peoto-day at Dedham, irrespective of party, to re-monstrate against the Nebraska bill. Speeches were made by the Hon. Charles F. Adams and others. A series of resolutions, selemnly pro-testing, and calling upon the people of the dis-trict to remonstrate against the measure, were

Large Robbery. BUFFALO, FEB. 16 .- A man residing at Fre donia, while on his way to New York, was robbed of \$14 000 last night, at Hornellsville, by women who had followed him.

Trial Trip. New YORK, FER. 17.—The steamer Prince-ton and the caloric ship Ericsson went down the bay to-day on a trial trip.

New York, Fee. 17.—The United States steamer Fulton sailed from Neuvitas on the 3d instant, for Cardenas.

Markets.

Markets.

Baltimore, Feb. 18, 12 M.—Flour firmer; sales of 1,000 barrels of Howard Street, at \$8.25, generally held higher; City Mills held at \$8.37. Wheat—sales of 3,000 bushels, white, at \$1.90 a \$1.95; red, at \$1.88 a \$1.90. Corn—sales of 80,000 bushels of white at 83 a 86 cents. Whiskey sold at 32½ cents per gallon. Other articles unchanged.

New York, Feb. 18, 1 P. M.—Flour dull: sales of 2,000 barrels State brands at \$8.75 to \$9; Southern at \$9 to \$9.25. Wheat—sales of 5,000 bushels; red at \$1.95 to \$2. Corn declined; sales of 18,000 bushels mixed at 98 cents; yellow at \$1. Cotton and stocks un changed.

Review of the Bultimore Market. Baltimore, Fee. 18.—The business of the past week has been steady, but not especially active. The supply of breadstuffs—both flour and grain—is moderate, but prices have receded. More firmness has been caused in coffee,

by the recent favorable advices from Rio. No

by the recent favorable advices from Rio. No especial change in sugars and molasses.

The Western and Southern trade is increasing, and the general indications of an active spring trade are favorable.

Prices of flour and grain of last Saturday, compared with to-day's prices:

Feb. 11.—Sales of Howard Street flour, at \$8.75; wheat, red and white, at \$2.02 a \$2.10; corn, white and yellow, at 93 to 95 cents.

Feb. 18.—Sales of Howard Street and City Mills flour, at \$8.25 a \$8.37; wheat, white and red, at \$1.88 a \$1.95; corn, at 83 to 86 cts.

It will be seen that the prices of all kinds of breadstuffs have declined. The prices of flour since the last review have been fluctuating between \$8.75, at which 2,000 barrels were sold on Saturday, and \$8, at which 2 000 barrels were sold yesterday under the effects of the Canada's news; upon which there has been a slight advance to-day. The same fluctuation in the prices of wheat and corn, and decline under the Canada's news, is noticeable—the decline of both in price being from 10 to 15 cents.

The tendency of prices in the stock market during the past week has been upward, al-though the business was not very active—the whole amount of sales in the Baltimore Board being only about \$283,000 against \$500,000 last week.

Canada at Boston. BOSTON, FEB. 18.—The steamer Canada has

arrived at this port, from Halifax.

All the papers indicate a warlike aspect of affairs in Europe, but there is nothing additional to what you have already received. Steamer Pacific Sailed. NEW YORK, FEB. 18 .- The steamer Pacific has sailed, to-day, with seventy passengers, in-cluding Mr. Bower, consul to Bordeaux, and five bearers of despatches. She carries no

specie.
Sterling exchange declining.

Africa Still Ashore, etc. NEW YORK, FEB. 18 .- The Africa is still

ashore. The America is to take her place on Wednesday. Notes on the Merchant's Bank of New Jer-Maine Liquor Law.

Annapolis, Feb. 17.—The Maine Liquor bill has been ordered to be engrossed. CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, Feb. 7, 1854.

To the Editor of the National Era: I think you are personally acquainted with our highly-gifted Senator in Congress, the Hon. Stephen A. Douglas, and that, with all the po-Stephen A. Douglas, and that, with all the po-litical prejudice you may entertain against him, you cannot fail to know as well as we do, that he has a kind and generous heart, and many other honorable and estimable traits of

In Northern Illinois Mr. Douglas has long been a favorite, and by his own deportment has raised himself to a most enviable position, not only in the estimation of his party, but the people at large. What, then, think you, is the measure of indignation we feel at the treatment he has received at the hands of his pretended friends in Washington? While they have intoxicated him with their cowardly carosses to his face, they have secretly and behind his back combined to dig his political grave, and now stand ready to push him in.

Who are the cowards that dared not meet him before the people for their high favor, but have thus meanly plotted against him, and spread the snare to effect his downfall? B.

MARRIAGES

MARRIAGES.

On Tuesday evening, the 14th instant, by the Rev. Mr. Pyne, Henry D. Johnson to Mary, youngest daughter of Col. J. J. Abert. In Philadelphia, on the 16th instant, by the Rev. P. F. Mayer, William Clabauch, of Georgetown, D. C., to Mary A., daughter of John Buddy, Esq., of the former city.

On yesterday morning, the 17th instant, Mr. ROBERT CAMMACK, in the 23d

son of Mr. Wm. Cammack.

The friends of the family are invited to attend his funeral to-morrow afternoon at 3 o'clock, from his father's residence, above

The Rev. Mason Noble will preach in the Sixth Presbyterian Church, corner of Sixth and C streets south, to-morrow, at 11 A. M., and 7 o'clock P. M., in the basement of this new edifice. The public are invited to attend.

Rev. W. H. Milburn, chaplain of the lonse of Representatives, will preach in the Capitol to-morrow morning, at 11 o'clock. Subect: The Christian Idea of Woman and her

Rev. Alexander Duncanson, pastor of the Congregational Church on Fifth street, west of the City Hall, will preach to-morrow at 11 A. M. and 31 P. M. Subject in the morning: The Unity of the Church.

pected to preach in St. Paul's English Lutheran Church (Rev. J. G. Butler's) corner of Eleventh and H streets, to-morrow, at 11 o'clock A. M., and at 716 P.M. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper will be administered at 11 A. M. IT Ira Buckman, Esq., of New York, and

Rev. Dr. Morris, of Baltimore, may be ex-

others, will address the friends of Prohibition at Temperance Hall, main saloon, to-morrow, at 7 P. M. Seats free. Rev. Thomas Johnson, of Nebraska, will preach in the Methodist Episcopal Church South, Eighth street, between H and I, to mor-

row, at 11 o'clock A. M.; and the pastor, Rev. James A. Dunean, at 716 P. M. IF A general meeting of the Masonic fra ternity of the District of Columbia is hereby salled for Monday evening next, 20th inst., at 7 o'clock, to hear the report of the committee

appointed at the last meeting, relative to the erection of a Masonie Temple. B. B. FRENCH, Chairman.

IF Service in the Church of the Ascension H street, between Ninth and Tenth, to-morrow, at 11 o'clock A. M., and at 314 P. M. The Rev. Eleazer Williams, missionary to the St. Regis Indians, will preach, and a collection will be taken in aid of the Indian missions.

Rev. Phineas D. Gurley, D. D., pasto elect, will, by Divine permission, preach in the F street Presbyterian Church, to morrow, at 11 o'clock A. M., and at 316 P. M.

THE HUTCHINSON FAMILY. PROM the Old Granite State, are happy to an nounce to the citizens of Washington that they will give three of their VOCAL ENTERTAINMENTS AT CARUSI'S SALOON,

commencing on this (Friday) evening, February 17, 1854, and positively closing Monday, the 20th, introducing their new compositions.

Tickets 50 cents; children half price—to be had at the principal Music and Bookstores.

Doors open at 6½ o'clock; Concert to commence at 7½ o'clock.

Feb. 17.